

**REMARKS**

**I. Formal Matters**

By this Amendment, Applicants add new dependent claim 14. As a result, claims 1-14 are all the claims pending in the Application. New claim 14 is fully supported throughout the specification.

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the receipt of priority documents submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). Applicants further thank the Examiner for initialing the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) submitted on March 18, 2004. Additionally, Applicants thank the Examiner for accepting the drawings filed on February 9, 2004.

**II. Rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0085284 (hereinafter “Nakamura 284”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0035929 (hereinafter “Nakamura 929”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,818,263 (hereinafter “Shimodaira”). Applicants respectfully submit the following in traversal of the prior art rejection.

Regarding claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Shimodaira fails to disclose “a maximum height Rz according to JIS B 0601-2001 ... set at 0.04  $\mu\text{m}$  or less.” Instead, Shimodaira discloses a resin sheet with a smooth outer-surface of the base layer, wherein “‘smooth’ ... means that the surface roughness (Ra) of the layer determined in accordance with JIS B 0601-1994 is 1 nm or lower.” See Shimodaira col. 11 lines 24-30. Nowhere do Nakamura 284, Nakamura 929, and Shimodaira teach or suggest a maximum height Rz of any given value. Furthermore, Shimodaira refers to a different version of the Japanese Industrial Standards (JIS)

than the one recited in claim 1. *See, e.g.*, Shimodaira col. 11 line 29. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that Shimodaira cannot overcome the deficiencies of Nakamura 284 and Nakamura 929 to render claim 1 obvious.

Additionally, the Examiner asserts that “Shimodaira teaches a smooth base layer according to the proposed JIS standard as optimal for attaching optical layers.” *See* Office Action pg. 3. However, Shimodaira does not teach that smooth surfaces are ideal for attaching **all** optical layers. *See* Shimodaira col. 11 lines 30-32 (“Such a smooth surface of the base layer facilitates formation of an **alignment film, transparent electrode, and other layers thereon.**”). Indeed, it is well known in the art that certain optical effects arise from the specific nature of the **interface** between multiple layers, and the characteristics of such interfaces are dependent on the properties (such as surface roughness) of the surfaces that are brought together to make those interfaces. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that Shimodaira cannot make up for the deficiencies of Nakamura 284 and Nakamura 929 to render claim 1 obvious.

Further, regarding the motivation to combine Nakamura 929 and Nakamura 284 with Shimodaira, because the anti-glare, anti-reflection films disclosed in Nakamura 929 and Nakamura 284 have both anti-glare properties as well as anti-reflective properties, the product that results from combining Nakamura 929 with Nakamura 284 has both anti-glare and anti-reflection properties. If this product of Nakamura 929 and Nakamura 284, exhibiting both anti-glare and anti-reflection properties, is combined with Shimodaira’s particle-dispersed resin sheet which can be a flat base layer, the resulting product would be a new optical film having both anti-glare and anti-reflection properties. It is inconceivable to combine these references in this manner such that one of the anti-glare property or the anti-reflection property is deteriorated,

resulting in an anti-reflection layer with anti-reflection properties **but no anti-glare properties**, as is the case with the present invention. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine the disclosures of Nakamura 929 and Nakamura 284 with the disclosure of Shimodaira in order to obtain the present invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, and 11, which ultimately depend from independent claim 1, are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

**III. Rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nakamura 284 in view of Nakamura 929 and Shimodaira and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,847,795 (hereinafter “Satoh”).

Applicants respectfully submit that Satoh fails to cure the deficiencies of Nakamura 284, Nakamura 929, and Shimodaira. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4, which ultimately depends from independent claim 1, is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1.

**IV. Rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has further rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nakamura 284 in view of Nakamura 929 and Shimodaira and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,206,005 (hereinafter “Yamashita”).

Applicants respectfully submit that Yamashita fails to cure the deficiencies of Nakamura 284, Nakamura 929, and Shimodaira. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8 and 9, which ultimately depend from independent claim 1, are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

**V. Allowable Subject Matter**

Claim 5 is objected to by the Examiner as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 should be deemed allowable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1, and also by virtue of its ultimate dependency from independent claim 1. Applicants also respectfully request holding the rewriting of claim 5 in abeyance at least until arguments presented with respect to claim 1 have been considered.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 12 and 13 have been allowed.

**VI. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

This Amendment is being filed via the USPTO Electronic Filing System (EFS).

Applicants herewith petition the Director of the USPTO to extend the time for reply to the above-identified Office Action for an appropriate length of time if necessary. Any fee due under 37 U.S.C. § 1.17(a) is being paid via the USPTO Electronic Filing System (EFS). The USPTO is also directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Susan Perry Pan  
Registration No. 41,239

Date: July 1, 2008